



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Hideyuki KUWANO et al.

Mail Stop: PCT

Serial No. 11/629,075

Attorney Docket No. 2006\_2081A

Filed December 11, 2006

**PRINTER** 

[Corresponding to PCT/JP2005/010346

Filed June 6, 2005]

### SUBMISSION OF ENGLISH VERSIONS OF INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY AND WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith for consideration by the Examiner are:

- An English version of the International Preliminary Report on Patentability; and
- 1) An English version of the Written Opinion of the International Searching 2)

Authority.

Respectfully submitted,

Hideyuki KUWANO et al.

Michael S. Huppert Registration No. 40,268

Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf Washington, D.C. 20006-1021 Telephone (202) 721-8200 Facsimile (202) 721-8250 January 29, 2007

#### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

## **PCT**

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference P39138-P0	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below	
International application No. PCT/JP2005/010346	International filing date (day/month/year) 06 June 2005 (06.06.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 15 June 2004 (15.06.2004)	
	h edition unless older edition indicated) PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUS	TRIAL CO., LTD.		

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).				
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 4 sheets, including this cover sheet.  In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.				
3.	This report contains indications relating to the following items:				
	Box No. I	Basis of the report			
	Box No. II	Priority			
	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinicapplicability	on with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial		
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention			
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under applicability; citations and	Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial explanations supporting such statement		
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited			
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the intern	national application		
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the	international application		
4.	4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).				
			Date of issuance of this report 20 December 2006 (20.12.2006)		
			Authorized officer		

Yoshiko Kuwahara

e-mail: pt07@wipo.int

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70 Form PCT/IB/373 (January 2004)

The International Bureau of WIPO

34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

#### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) FOR FURTHER ACTION Applicant's or agent's file reference See paragraph 2 below P39138-P0 International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) International application No. 15.06.2004 06.06.2005 PCT/JP2005/010346 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC Applicant MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. III Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Authorized officer Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Telephone No.

Facsimile No.

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/010346

Box	No. I	Basis of this opinion	
1.	With	regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was unless otherwise indicated under this item.	
		This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language . which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under	
	-	Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).	
2.	With	n regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed ntion, this opinion has been established on the basis of:	
	a.	type of material	
		a sequence listing	
		table(s) related to the sequence listing	
	b.	format of material	
		in written format	
		in computer readable form	
	c.	time of filing/furnishing	
		contained in the international application as filed.	
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.	
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.	
3.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.	
4.	Ac	dditional comments:	
1			
ļ			

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/010346

Ī	Box	No. V Reasoned statemen citations and explan	t under Ru nations sup	le 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability, porting such statement	
Ī	1.	Statement			
١		Novelty (N)	Claims	4-11	YES
		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		1-3, 12-14	МО
		Inventive step (IS)		8-11	YES
			Claims	1-7, 12-14	NO
		Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-14	YES
			Claims		- NO

Citations and explanations:

Document 1: JP, 2004-072350, A (Canon Inc.), 4 March, 2004 (04.03.04), paragraphs [0043], [0054], [0060], Fig.7 & US, 2004-0021901, A1 & CN, 1508757, A

Document 2: JP, 2003-216367, A (Canon Inc.), 31 July, 2003 (31.07.03), paragraphs [0033], [0065] to [0076], Figs.19-23 & US, 2003-0137691, A1

Document 3: JP, 2004-164561, A (Seiko Epson Corp.), 10 June, 2004 (10.06.04), paragraphs [0117] to [0122] & US, 2004-0218209, A1

The subject matters of claims 1-3 and 12-14 do not appear to be novel or to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 (paragraphs [0043], [0054], [0060], Fig.7) cited in the ISR.

The subject matters of claims 4-7 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of document 1, and document 2 (paragraphs [0033], [0065] to [0076], Figs.19-23) cited in the ISR. A person skilled in the art could have easily conceived of applying maximum fit drawing described in document 2 to document 1.

The subject matters of claims 8-11 are neither described in any of the documents cited in the ISR nor obvious to a person skilled in the art.